



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q62085

Akira YAMAGUCHI

Appln. No.: 09/782,042

Group Art Unit: 2871

Confirmation No.: 8214

Examiner: Minh Toan T. TON

Filed: February 14, 2001

For: COLLIMATING PLATE, LIGHTING APPARATUS AND LIQUID CRYSTAL
DISPLAY APPARATUS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated May 23, 2003, please consider the following
remarks:

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 12-23 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-6 and 8-11 presently stand rejected. Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In regard to the claim rejections, claims 1, 3, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishihara (USP 6,946,100); claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishihara; and claims 5, 6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Disclosed Art (APA) in view of Ishihara.

RECEIVED
OCT 27 2003
TECHNOLOGY DIVISION

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/782,042

For the reasons that follow, Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections and requests favorable disposition of the application.

Argument

Applicant submits that the prior art cited fails to teach or otherwise disclose all the features recited in the claims and, thus, the claims are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited prior art.

In particular, in regard to the §102 rejection of claim 1, Applicant submits that Ishihara does not teach at least the requirement that the size of each microlens satisfies the equation, $S_r \geq 2t \tan \Theta + R$. The Examiner, although not explicitly stated, appears to be asserting that the Ishihara disclosure *inherently* satisfies the above equation requirement of claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner has provided an alleged derivation of the equation recited in claim 1.

The Examiner has made some improper assumptions, however, in order to “derive” the recited equation. For example, there is no disclosure in Ishihara that would lead a skilled artisan to the conclusion that the figure drawn by the Examiner, and provided in the attachment to the office action, is equivalent to the microlens structure recited in the claim. As a result, there is nothing within Ishihara that would preclude, for example, the size of the microlenses shown in Fig. 6 of Ishihara from being other than that which is required by the claim. Specifically, the size of the microlenses disclosed in Ishihara could, potentially, satisfy the following equation, $S_r < 2t \tan \Theta + R$, which contravenes the explicit requirement of the claim. Therefore, for at least this reason, Ishihara does not anticipate claim 1 or any claim dependent on claim 1, specifically, claims 3 and 4.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/782,042

Additionally, in regard to claim 4, Ishihara does not disclose any specific values for the refractive index of the lens substrate. For this additional reason, Ishihara does not anticipate claim 4.

In regard to the obviousness rejection of claim 2, Applicant submits that Ishihara fails to even suggest the claimed *diffuse reflecting layer*. The apparatus in Ishihara is completely different than the claimed device. In particular, Ishihara discloses, as shown for example in Fig. 6, a “reflection reducing coating” formed between the glass substrate and the light exit side opposite the microlenses. The reflection reducing coating in covers the entire bottom side of the glass substrate and is intended reduce the reflection of light that passes through the pinhole array 7. Claim 2 of the present application, in comparison, explicitly requires *a diffuse reflecting layer* that covers “other area than said plurality of light entrance areas.” The purpose of the recited diffuse reflecting layer is clearly to reflect light on the light entrance side of the collimating plate except in the recited *light entrance areas*. Accordingly, Ishihara does not and can not suggest the features added to claim 1 by claim 2 and, thus, Ishihara does not render claim 2 obvious.

With respect to claims 5, 6 and 8-11, as discussed above, Ishihara does not teach, disclose or otherwise suggest the specific size requirement placed on the microlenses. Thus, Ishihara, either taken alone or in combination with that which is disclosed in the present application as conventional, does not render obvious any of claims 5, 6 and 8-11.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/782,042

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Barner
Registration No. 46,075

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 23, 2003

Attorney Docket No.: Q62085